## REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration is requested.

Claims 1, 4, 6-8, and 13-15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Okada (U.S. 6,148,140). Also, as shown on page 4 of the Office Action, claims 9 and 12 are also apparently included in this rejection. In item 7 beginning on page 5, claims 9 and 11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Okada in view of Teo (U.S. 5,621,464). In item 8 beginning on page 7, claims 10 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Okada in view of Teo and Asai (U.S. 6,710,785). These rejections are traversed and are inapplicable to the claims as amended herein for the following reasons.

Each of independent claims 1, 6, 12, and 14 includes a recitation directed to detecting whether the values of the display order information for the pictures to be included in the generated coded stream are sequential or non-sequential, where being sequential is being incremental by one and being non-sequential is a state other than being incremental by one. Each of independent claims 8, 13, and 15 includes a recitation directed to extracting a flag indicating a position where the display order information for the pictures to be included in the generated coded stream are sequential or non-sequential, and that being sequential is being incremental by one and being non-sequential is a state other than being incremental by one.

The primary reference, Okada, does not disclose or suggest such features. Okada discloses, in column 45, lines 19-48, as pointed out by the Examiner, a process for justifying, in reconstruction of GOP, the display order and coding order at the editing boundary for VOB, but does not disclose the above-mentioned features directed to the display order information sequentiality as being incremental by one and being non-sequentiality as being a state other than being incremental by one as recited in claims 1, 6, 8, and 12-15.

Okada also discloses, in column 26, lines 46-64, as pointed out by the Examiner, a seamless flag indicating whether or not the VOB is seamlessly reproduced, but does not disclose the display order information sequentiality as being incremental by one and being non-

9

sequentiality as being a state other than being incremental by one as recited in claims 1, 6, 8, and 12-15.

The secondary reference, Teo, and the tertiary reference, Asai, do not provide a disclosure or suggestion of the claimed features discussed above which are absent from the primary reference Okada, nor does the Examiner rely on these references for such a teaching. Therefore, no obvious combination of Okada, Teo, and/or Asai would have resulted in, or in any way rendered obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the inventions recited in claims 1, 6, 8, or 12-15. Accordingly, it is submitted that all of pending claims 1, 4, and 6-15 are allowable over the prior art of record.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Youji NOTOYA et al.

/Jeffrey R. Filipek/

By: 2009.04.15 13:33:47 -04'00'
_____
Jeffrey R. Filipek
Registration No. 41,471
Attorney for Applicants

JRF/fs
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
April 15, 2009